



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*Mathematik und Philosophie bei Plato.* Von DR. RUDOLF EBELING. *Jahresbericht des Gymnasiums zu Hann. Münden.* Mündener Tageblatt-Druckerei, 1909. Pp. 28.

This treatise, as its title implies, adds nothing to our knowledge of the history of mathematics and makes no attempt to solve the specific mathematical puzzles of the *Meno*, the *Republic*, and the *Timaeus*, but it is a useful résumé and discussion of all Plato's allusions to the subject. Assuming the dates of the dialogues as given in Raeder or the fifth edition of Christ, it endeavors to trace the evolution of Plato's thought in relation to mathematics. After the *Republic* a period of skepticism is assumed whose first literary document is the *Theætetus*. Plato criticizes his own former views and attempts an empirical reconstruction of philosophy. The old antithesis and dualism of opinion and knowledge, however, still persist in the *Philebus*, and cannot, Ebeling frankly admits, be sophisticated away. It is also, he admits, explicitly affirmed in the *Timaeus*. If it disappears in the *Laws*, we cannot know whether Plato had changed his mind or despaired of a solution. Ebeling, then, after all is unable to construct a continuous evolution for Plato's thought. He finds it rather a curve with two highest points, one in the middle, the other at the end. The *Epinomis* he accepts as genuine, as he does the *Letters*, including the second! It is the end and the summit of Platonic philosophy, the union of science and religion.

In my *Unity of Plato's Thought* I endeavored to show, not that Plato never changed his mind or mood, but that sound interpretation of the dialogues affords no basis for current hypotheses of a fundamental reconstruction of his philosophy in or soon after the *Republic*. I have since illustrated this in the case of Gomperz's otherwise admirable *History of Greek Philosophy* (see *Classical Philology*, Vol. I, p. 295). Space fails to follow Ebeling's arguments in detail; I can only record my doubt or dissent in a few typical instances. Quite fanciful is the suggestion that the respectful (!) treatment of Hippias in the two dialogues that bear his name is probably due to the fact that Plato drew his mathematical inspiration from the Sophist.

There is no reason except the desire to be exhaustive for mentioning the hedonistic calculus or measuring art of the *Protagoras* as the beginning of the application of mathematics to philosophy. It is hard to understand what is meant by speaking of the ἐξ ὑποθέσεως σκοπεῖν of the *Meno* as a method of "experiment." As a matter of fact no sharp line can be drawn between the definition as an hypothesis and the idea as an hypothesis. Compare, e. g., *Meno* 87 B with *Euthyphro* 11 C and "already" *Hippias Major* 288 A εἰ τί ἐστι αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν. See *Unity*, n. 86. The argument that Plato in the *Phaedo* has overcome the doubts about the theory of ideas expressed in the *Meno* is met by the references in

*Unity*, nn. 191, 192. The alleged contradiction between the *Theætetus* and the *Republic* about μή δν is explained away, *ibid.*, pp. 53 ff. The reference to *Republic* 475 for a contradiction of the statement in *Theætetus* 155 E that πράξεις and γενέσεις are όντα is quite irrelevant. In the *Theætetus* πράξεις and γενέσεις are abstractions which nominalists and crass materialists refuse to recognize at all. The *Republic* passage merely satirizes lovers of sights and sounds who are devoted to particular concrete πράξεις and γενέσεις (the words do not occur) namely, theatrical exhibitions, etc. The irrelevance of the comparison appears at once if we cite four words of the *Theætetus* context, πράξεις δὲ καὶ γενέσεις καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἄόρατον. Cf. *Cratyl.* 386 E.

PAUL SHOREY

*The General Civil and Military Administration of Noricum and Raetia.* By MARY BRADFORD PEAKS. Reprint from the University of Chicago Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. IV, pp. 161-230. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1907.

In the preface of the *Roman Provinces* Mommsen remarks that a correct view of the Imperial period cannot be obtained if the histories of the several provinces be left out of consideration. This is the typical attitude of latter-day historical criticism. We have come to realize that, for our world, Roman history was as truly in the making in the provincial *concilia* and the outlying garrison-towns as in the Curia and the barracks of the praetorians. The present monograph is a well-planned addition to the increasing series of special studies of Roman provinces which the exactions of the modern spirit have suggested.

Miss Peaks discusses first in a general way the officials who figured in the administration of the provinces, their ranks, titles, and functions. The *Fasti* of the provinces follow. Each name, after Liebenam's method, is accompanied by the literary and the epigraphical data by which its position is fixed. Numerous additions, of course, have been made to the antiquated lists compiled over twenty years ago by Liebenam in *Die Laufbahn der Procuratoren*, Jena, 1886, and *Die Legaten in den römischen Provinzen*, Leipzig, 1888. Material furnished by the supplementary volumes of *CIL* III and an occasional grain of data gleaned from recent periodical literature have enabled the author to insert several names not catalogued in the *Prosopographia*. Cf. p. 175, No. 15; p. 185, No. 3; p. 189, No. 15, etc. Sabinus, assigned by Liebenam and the *Prosopographia* to Noricum will be found among the legates of Raetia.

Part II, "The Army," catalogues the legionary and the auxiliary forces stationed in Noricum and Raetia — which were, for minor provinces,